DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 662 JC 710 050

AUTHOR Deegan, William L.
TITLE Student Government and Student Participation in Junior College Governance--Models for the 1970's.
PUB DATE 19 Jan 70
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization, College Administration, *Faculty Organizations, *Governance, Governing Boards, *Junior Colleges, Student Leadership, *Student Organizations, Student Participation

ABSTRACT

It is the author's contention that student government revitalization will come only when student government begins to play a substantive role in policy making and implementation. The purpose of this paper is to consider, criticize, and propose a number of models for student participation in junior college governance. The first, a traditional model, which sees student government as an educational experience, is rejected on the grounds of paternalism and because it is "in loco parentis." The second, a jurisdictional model is rejected because of its emphasis on increased fragmentation and the potential for confrontations of positions arrived at with little prior communication. The author prefers three participatory models. The first is a federal model with a faculty senate, student assembly, and administrative executive, and with established procedures for intercommunication. The second is a delineation of areas of primary responsibility for faculty, administration, and students. The third, and most controversial model, is a "college senate" with faculty and students as voting members. It is stressed that the administration is still a key component in governance and that the models should not seek to eliminate the voice of the administrators or reduce their role to that of token errand boy. In the end, only abilities and rationality of trustees, faculty, students, and administrators will determine the success or failure of any given model. (CA)

ED047662

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT AND STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN JUNIOR COLLEGE GOVERNANCE-- MODELS FOR THE 1970'S

William L. Deegan

January 19, 1970

JC 710 050

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 0 8 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Emerson once wrote "What you are speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you are saying." Today, on many college campuses, the traditional "student government" associations that have existed for years are being drowned out, overturned, or simply left to die quietly because of the gap between what they are and what they say they are.

While many faculty and administrators praise the process of participation in student government, many students castigate the very same process as devoid of substantive meaning or effect. As one author recently put it: "The truth of the matter is that these student governments have no real authority, are not integrated with the mechanisms for institutional governance, and are not respected by the student bodies. They serve primarily as popularity contests for those so inclined, and as means of convincing accrediting associations of student involvement."[1]

The present condition of student government associations at many colleges is sad indeed. Frequently, candidates run for office unopposed, few students bother to vote in campus elections, and the student government associations themselves tend to spend their time on endless procedural wrangles, rarely considering substantive matters, and not possessing any real power to deal with substantive matters anyway. On many campuses, ad hoc student groups spring up to deal with matters of concern to students, completely bypassing the existing "duely elected" channels of student government and dealing directly with the administration. Student officers often find themselves in positions as followers not leaders.

Concerned over some of the current trends toward violent student protest on college campuses and the relative decline of student government associations on many campuses, the American Association of Junior Colleges Commission on Student Personnel formed a subcommittee charged to study the "Revitalization of Student Governments."

A Basic Premise

The very first thing the Subcommittee did was to broaden the perspective of the charge by unanimously accepting the following basic premise: The first step to revitalize student governments must be to create an atmosphere where student governments can become effective participants in the decision-making process. It is not enough to concentrate merely on "procedures for developing leadership among students of two-year colleges." The relevance of student government to the purposes, directions, and policies of the institution, and the nature of the reward system that serves as an additional incentive for the most qualified students to participate must also be examined.

It is the position of the Subcommittee that a focus on procedures for revitalization of student government such as workshops, seminars or other such mechanisms would only be self-defeating if the students who emerge from those workshops or seminars continue to function in a vacuum devoid of authority, responsibility, or legitimacy.

The purpose of this report is to consider, criticize, and propose a number of models for student participation in governance, rather than merely focusing on student government as a separate entity. Since it is the contention of this Subcommittee that revitalization of student governments will come only when student governments begin to play a substantive role in policy making and implementation, each model will be presented and discussed in terms of its potential for contributing to the realization of this basic goal.

After an examination of numerous trends and developments in governance, three general models were selected as representative of the major approaches to governance currently being discussed. Of course, many variations of these general models can be found (and in some cases are referred to in this paper), but it is felt that the basic philosophic approach implied in each model generally covers the spectrum of current thought in higher education.

The three general models selected are the traditional model, the separate jurisdictions model, and the participatory model. Let us begin our analysis with a consideration of a model that has been in effect in both junior colleges and four-year colleges for some time.

The Traditional Model - Student Government as an Educational Experience

The traditional model of student participation in governance is a general model from which many forms emanate. Regardless of the form, the underlying philosophy remains essentially constant. In its most open form, the philosophy is simply one of "in loco parentis," where the parent-child relationship is perpetuated and student participation in governance is limited to such matters as social events, athletic rallies, and the newspaper. In another form, the philosophy is couched in terms such as "student advice" or "student self government," which when translated by students, often means tokenism or self rule over trivial affairs.

The general structure for this kind of model is usually one where there are separate faculty and student organizations with ever-changing duties and functions. Student leaders may appear at faculty senate meetings, and sometimes may serve as committee members, although they are often restricted by clauses such as the following: "student members may be present at a meeting of the faculty senate only during such time as the report of their committee is under discussion, but shall not have the privilege of making motions or voting."

The end product of the traditional model is a system of hierarchial authority running from students at the bottom through faculty in the middle to the administration. Each segment functions in its own area, often with little intercommunication or contact with the other segments before positions harden. Student participation in the governance of the institution is often limited to an "advisory" position with the emphasis on the "process" and "educational value" of student self government rather than on the substance and consequences of that process

While the process has merit as an educational experience, the result of this kind of paternalistic approach to student participation in governance is often student apathy, alienation, and circumvention. Thus, the rise of militant ad hoc groups who bypass the student government mechanism and deal directly with the administration often with successful results. The "elected" student government officers often find themselves as mere spectators or else in the embarrassing position of having to seek acceptance by the various ad hoc groups, often not in a leadership capacity. As one recent report stated:

> "Student government on this campus is presently mired in a Serbonian Bog from which there can be no escape. Its legal standing is ambiguous; its political power is nonexistent; and the miasma of conflicting theories, incompatible functions, contrary procedures, and impossible rules which envelopes the terrain makes it impossible for even the most earnest pilgrim to find his way to higher ground."[2]

The extent of student indifference to student government is reflected in the following survey of students voting in student government elections in 85 California junior colleges. Over 83 percent of the colleges had fewer than 40 percent of the students vote in the spring 1969 election, and over 38 percent of the colleges had less than 20 percent of the students vote in the spring election. This kind of indifference seriously hinders the legitimacy of the positions of student leaders as they try to develop an effective student voice in the affairs of the institution.

A further complicating factor is that student elections are often run on the basis of undefined constituencies which prohibit communications and accountability and make the student government merely another distant bureaucracy. As Shoben has put it: "There is also a metastasizing element of impersonality, of a supply of niches too small to accommodate the range of people in quest of significant places in the community, of a growing distance between identifiable persons and the loci of decisions that affect their lives and their destinies."[3]

This analysis is akin to Archibald MacLeish's contention that the fragmentations and complications of life have led to a paralyzing sense of impotence and a concept of "diminished man."[4] As students resist this fragmentation, this compartmentalization, they will demand more voice in decisions that affect their lives. The old cry that "I don't make the rules, I only enforce them" is the master cliche of the 1960's. Clearly, to students who were instrumental in the downfall of a president, who risked their lives for the cause of racial justice, and who are perhaps better educated and more aware than any previous generation in the history of the world, tokenism and ineffective government will no longer do. The traditional model which has often focused on student government as a process must change to focus on student participation in governance in a substantive manner. Those who live under the rules must have a voice in making those rules.

The Separate Jurisdictions Model

The second model for student participation in governance is an outgrowth of the frustrations caused by the ineffectiveness of model one. Many persons, frustrated by unsuccessful attempts to bring the community together to insure a voice in decision-making, have given up and now wish to separate it further by seeking complete autonomy over certain areas and then using whatever power they can accumulate to negotiate decisions in other areas.

Basically, there are two main ways in which this model may manifest itself.* The first is the attempt by students to withdraw (with some faculty) into completely autonomous departments or colleges as was suggested by some students

*For examples of this approach and the delineation of functions, see Auerbach, Carl, "Task Force Recommendations on Student Representation in the University Senate and Campus Assemblies." Unpublished paper; University of Minnesota, 1969, and "Student Rights and Freedoms, Procedural Considerations for the Two-Year Colleges," Northampton County Area Community College.

and faculty at San Francisco State and Berkeley last year. Under this plan, the autonomous units would have complete control over hiring practices, curriculum, and all policies and procedures of the unit.

A second variation of this model is the attempt to delineate certain areas of jurisdiction for the various "interest groups" that exist on campus. As one report recently stated:

> "We are thus asked to assume that the campus consists of three components, the 'students,' 'faculty members,' and 'administrative officers,' each having an area of primary concern. Clearly the campus 'society' is here viewed as a collection of status-bound interest groups, each having a special preserve and each possessing claims to participation in varying degrees--subject to negotiation in the activities assigned to the other components."[5]

This attempt to further fragment the academic community is fraught with a number of dangers. The first modification of the model--completely autonomous academic units--runs the risk of becoming a collection of fragmented compartments (which, some argue, most colleges already are) with no coherent goals or programs. Other problems have been cited in a recent study which warned against the dangers of departmental imbalances, loss of functional relationship among disciplines, extreme provincialism and inbreeding in the department, proliferation of courses, and unwise dispersing of scarce human and financial resources.[6]

The second modification of the model, areas of separate jurisdiction for different interest groups, is both unwise and unworkable. Intellectual communities are fragmented enough. We need to focus on mechanisms for integration, not further separation. A structure of separate jurisdictions sets the stage for confrontations of rigid positions formed by separate groups who have had little or no prior consultation or communication. Further, as a recent report suggested: "We are convinced that there are few student interests which can be successfully acted upon by a separate student organization removed from the general process of campus decision making. . . . We think it is important to distinguish between

the important goal of expanding the student role in governance and the erroneous assumption that a strengthened separate, central government is the most effective means to that end."[7]

The above criticisms of the traditional and separate jurisdictions models led the commission to focus on alternative models for student participation in governance. It should be emphasized that the following "participatory" models are general models which should help to suggest approaches which can be modified to fit the unique context of a particular school. Hopefully, different schools will experiment with some variations of these models and seek to empirically validate or refute the feasibility and consequences of some of these approaches to student participation in governance.

Participatory Models

As one student recently stated in a letter to his school paper about the causes of student unrest: "We are angry because we are powerless. We have no voice in the forces which so completely control our lives."[8] Perhaps this statement, more than any other, helps to answer the question of so many people who are concerned about student unrest--what is it all about? Of course, the issues vary from campus to campus, but one theme that seems to pervade the student movement is the demand for an effective voice in the college decision-making process.

The word "effective" is the key here. Tokenism and ineffective student government are no longer alternatives. As a recent report stated: "A tokenism which offers the promise but withholds the substance of participation can only worsen the situation."[9] Unfortunately, much of the time of many college administrators and boards of trustees has been spent in reaction rather than action, in trying to preserve what is instead of focusing on what needs to be. As the Study Commission on University Governance at Berkeley recently put it:

> "In the course of its investigations the Commission often found itself at a loss to explain why many members of the University could deplore

> recent events and criticize the actions of all parties to the disputes, yet be quite unwilling to believe that these might be rooted in some fundamental deficiencies in the structure."[10]

It is our belief that changes in the nature of this structure and in the context in which decisions are made might do much to help mitigate potential conflict and polarization. The present structures in many of our colleges either do not provide for any effective student voice in decision making (the traditional "students as advisors model") or set the stage for confrontations of rigid interest groups who have had little prior consultation, communication, or information (the separatist model). Neither of these structures appears to be a feasible alternative as a governance model in the 1970's.

Unfortunately, the frustration and alienation of many students in dealing with an "unresponsive system" has frequently led to a blind attack on that system as reflected in the often bureaucratic colleges. The despair of unproductive peaceful protest has also provided fertile ground for those who no longer see reform as an option and who would proceed with the neeessary revolution--"the only rational alternative." A further complication is that the colleges are often in the position of being a symbolic and readily accessible target for venting of frustrations with the war in Vietnam, the problems of the cities, or the corruption in society--problems over which the colleges have no direct control. However, the legitimacy of many student demands and the need for reform in governance processes are issues which must be confronted if our institutions of higher education are to continue to effectively and peacefully function. As one student leader recently stated: "Unless students are made to feel that their efforts can have some beneficial effect, a generation of young people may be driven to a wasteful nihilism and despair."[11] While this is an overstatement of the problem, it does enunciate the seriousness of the concerns and the determination of many students.

The Difficult Questions

Given these current trends and problems, what kinds of models of governance might be conducive to a reintegration of our colleges in a manner acceptable to most of the inhabitants of these academic communities? Is it possible, given the heterogeneity of values, interests, motives, and philosophies to have an academic community? How much conflict is inevitable? How could conflict be productively used? How could conflict be resolved without violent protest? These questions and many others relating to problems of governance have been under examination by a number of people for many years. There are no clear cut answers; there are no easy solutions. What has emerged from these examinations is a number of thoughtful proposals, most of which have not been implemented to any significant extent in very many of our colleges.

It was a basic premise of this report that any revitalization of student government must be considered in the broader context of student participation in governance. The rejection of the traditional and separatist models brings us to a focus on a number of participatory models for governance. The need for a variety of models is a natural consequence of the great diversity of colleges in higher education in America, each of which has a unique set of conditions which affect its governance context.

The first participatory model has been discussed in a paper by Shoben.[12] "In this design, the central administration is conceived as occupying a position analogous to that of the federal executive. Responsible for certain housekeeping functions such as plant management, accounting, etc., for fund-raising, and for public relations, (the administration) also has the initiative for leadership through the ways in which it reports on the state of the academic community, through the programs it formulates and recommends for action by appropriate legislative bodies, and through the style with which it implements the rules and enterprises enacted and defined by the suitable agencies within the community."[13]

Legislatively, a bicameral pattern involving faculty and students is proposed to represent the special interests of the total community. "The Faculty Senate may be conceived in at least its general outline along the usual lines, although there may be advantages in thinking, in institutions beyond some critical size, more of a representative body than after the fashion of the town meeting, of the full professorial staff. The Student Assembly would define a lower house in the legislature, relatively large in size and perhaps enjoying certain special powers--for instance, the initiation of all bills pertaining to the regulation of student conduct. The two houses would be connected by the familiar machinery of conference committees, joint commissions and task forces, formalized relationships between the president of the Faculty Senate and the Speaker of the Student Assembly, etc. The enactment of bills into college 'laws' would require the customary agreement between the two houses, thus assuring, among other things, the potency and meaningfulness of the Student Assembly and the involvement of the Faculty Senate in the full range of concerns animating the community."[14]

The proposal forsees giving ample academic credit and possibly stipends to Student Assemblymen to make the time and effort involved in governance more rewarding for work that will be "inevitably time consuming, sometimes draining to the spirit, and often disruptive of the pursuit of more personal and privatistic aims."[15] Student representatives to the assembly would be elected from small (100-200 population) districts or towns defined by expressed interests. For example, in a college of 5,000, perhaps 25 districts would be operating, thus allowing for more personalized contact with identifiable constituencies. Judicial functions might be handled by tribunal composed of faculty, students and administrators, with provisions for appeals and review.

While the identification of constituencies based on interests appears to be somewhat unrealistic, other means might be developed to try to overcome the

lack of identification caused by at-large elections. Some means of developing smaller identifiable constituencies as a basis for representation appears to be long overdue.

The extent to which agreements could be reached and the general efficiency and effectiveness of such a transformation can only be speculated upon. We have much rhetoric but little empirical evidence about how such a model would fare in actual operation. Somewhere in this country, some institutions of higher education should be willing to experiment with this kind of approach and evaluate the results in terms of its contributions to improving the functioning and effectiveness of the institution. If our colleges cannot experiment and test new ideas, who will?

A second variation of the participatory model is reflected in a paper by Richardson entitled, "Recommendations on Student Rights and Freedoms." The paper states:

> "It has been pointed out that the zone of acceptance for policies which result in effective action broadens as those who are affected participate in their determination. We know, too, that authority in an organization is dependent upon the assent of those governed. From these two statements we may conclude that if we are to achieve acceptance by students of organizational policies, we will need to involve them in the development of such policies or run the risk of arriving at conclusions that are unacceptable to those whom they are designed to serve."[16]

The model calls for the delineation of areas of primary responsibility for faculty, administrators, and students, but with established procedures for intercommunication and prior consultation before positions harden. The emphasis is on cooperation and participation, not separate power blocks. Joint faculty-student committees are also a key part of the proposal. Thus, after delineating the basic charges to the faculty and student senates, the paper proposes the following procedures:

1. "To improve communication between the two policy-recommending bodies, there should be representatives of each sent as observers to the other. Thus, there would be student advisers to the faculty organization and faculty advisers to the student organization. It would be

the responsibility of these advisers to comment on the point of view of their parent organization upon request, and to keep that organization informed of the activities of its counterpart.

2. Joint faculty-student standing committees should be established to deliberate and make recommendations to the two organizations. Faculty members should predominate, and there should be a faculty chairman for those joint committees where the matters considered involve areas of faculty leadership. Student members should predominate, and there should be a student chairman of committees involving matters of primary concern to the student.

   The membership of such committees would be determined by the faculty organization and by the student organization. Such committees would report to the faculty and student organizations in all matters involving policy formulation and to a designated administrator in matters involving administration.

3. An attempt should be made to ensure representiveness of the student organization by the election of candidates from defined constituencies as opposed to the at-large elections which are frequently the case at present. It is suggested that the division or department might serve as a basic reference point in defining constituencies."[17]

The keys to the implementation of this model lie in the commitment on the part of the administration to the importance of student and faculty involvement in institutional governance and in the commitment of the faculty and students to adequately prepare and contribute rationally for the good of the institutions. Without the goodwill and support of the administration, faculty and student senates will either degenerate to meaningless organizations or become staging areas for power politics in an endless cycle of confrontation. Without the commitment and preparation of faculty and students, the whole process will bog down in chaos and irrational time-wasting debate of issues devoid of needed factual evidence.

This model is also somewhat vulnerable to many of the criticisms of the separate jurisdictions model. Much faith is placed on the effectiveness of the mechanisms for liaison, and on the goodwill of all parties involved. An empirical test should be applied to this model or some variation of it so that the strengths and weaknesses of it could be documented and appropriate revisions made. Again, the unique context of a given institution will play a crucial role in determining the choice of a general model and the needed revisions.

The final participatory model to be explored in this paper is based on the concept of creating an all-college senate[18] composed of voting faculty and students sitting together in one body. Faculty and student representatives would be elected from designated constituencies on a formula basis. For example, each constituency of faculty might elect one faculty member for every 20 faculty of their rank. Each student constituency might elect one student for every 500 full-time students in that constituency. Administrators would serve in an executive-leadership role. That is, presenting ideas and proposals and executing finalized policies.

In no instance would students constitute a majority of the decision-making body. Primary areas of responsibility for policy development would be delegated to separate student and faculty senates, with each senate taking the initiative on matters which fall within its purview. Matters of all-college concern would be discussed and recommendations passed on to the all-college senate. The mechanism for delegation of matters would be the joint meeting of the faculty and student executive committees, which will periodically meet to decide what agenda items are to be considered the concern of which body. In theory all matters which are not specifically delegated to one of the bodies exclusively are to be the concern of the college senate.[19]

This model differs from the bicameral model (participatory model one) in that students and faculty are brought together into one college senate instead of requiring passage by separate houses for final policy recommendations. This model also differs from participatory model two in the direct joining of faculty and students in the college senate as opposed to the areas of primary responsibility and more informal liaison arrangements and joint committees advocated in the second participatory model.

The idea of students as voting members of a "College Senate" is an issue of some controversy. Any consideration of this model must be prepared to

confront the many objections to students as voting members on college wide committees, primarily the cries about the transience and apathy of students which usually run as follows: "The first argues that student participation is unwise since the transient status of students renders them less likely to act responsibly. The second argues that student participation is unnecessary since most students care nothing about these matters and are likely to be apathetic about taking advantage of opportunities to participate."[20]

While many of these cries have validity, there is also a kind of circular reasoning about the cause and effect of this transience and apathy. Some people feel that students are apathetic because they have no real voice, while others feel they have no interest or commitment to work to develop a real voice.* Until this model is implemented and tested over a reasonable length of time, it will be difficult to say what the real results of students participating as voting members on University Senate committees might be. Hopefully, some schools will experiment with the model and help provide more objective answers to questions and objections which, until now, have been largely emotional.

Administration - Still the Key Component

Up to this point, this paper has stressed the role of students in outlining several alternative models for student participation in governance. This is the main focus and intent of the paper. However, it is the strong belief of the commission that the primary reason that students attend college is to get an education, not to participate in governance. Likewise, the primary task of the faculty is teaching. The important aspect of the participatory models outlined

*For discussions of the pros and cons of student apathy and transience see: The Culture of the University: Governance and Education, Report of the Study Commission on University Governance, Berkeley, California, 1968, and Auerbach, Carl, "Task Force Recommendations on Student Representation in the University Senate and Campus Assemblies," unpublished paper, University of Minnesota, 1969.

in this paper is the opportunity that they provide for people affected by decisions to have a voice in those decisions. While the models stressed the roles of students and faculty in the decision-making process, they are not meant to omit the administration. In fact, quite the opposite. As many people are beginning to recognize, today, college administrators must be a very special and talented breed to be successful. The increased awareness by both faculty and students of power and politics, and the increased interest in governance questions by the public and the legislators of this country make each and every issue "potentially explosive."

Despite what has been written about mediation and negotiation, there is still a leadership role for administrators. In many cases, positive action by able leaders might have prevented some of the problems caused by inaction, reaction, or overreaction. While new models for increased participation in governance will not be a panacea for all problems, they may serve to make administration more acceptable by helping to increase the legitimacy and effectiveness of decisions by giving those affected by decisions a chance to air their views in a more effective manner. The keys to making the models work lie in the leadership capacities of the administration, and in the commitment and preparation levels of both faculty and students. As one report recently stated:

> "Administrators should not only respond--they should question, evaluate, propose, and stimulate. Perhaps the leader's primary task is to mobilize the human resources of an organization toward the attainment of clearly defined goals. These goals should be well understood and widely accepted. This means that they must be formulated through the participation of all those concerned with the welfare and growth of the college--administrators, faculty members, students. Goals once decided on are not likely to be good forever. There should be continuing dialogue about their validity, about the means necessary for their attainment, and about the discipline they should impose on the institution's activities. Such study and debate should stimulate initiative and innovation throughout the organization."[21]

Thus, what is sought is a change from arbitrary and hierarchial authority to a more collegial model for decision making. These models may offer hope and the opportunity to participate in decisions, or they may degenerate into power

conflicts or chaos. The results will vary by campus. The administration, as mentioned earlier, is still the key component. Collegial models should neither seek to eliminate the voice of administrators nor to reduce their role to that of a token errand boy.

Administrators in turn must communicate and share information and ideas more readily and must be prepared to accept different perspectives and to lose on occasion where proposals are not acceptable to a large number of the community.

More specifically, the functions of administrators as leaders include the following:

1. To search for new ideas wherever they may be found and to help bring these ideas to fruition. It has been said that the major role of academic leadership is to release the imagination and the inventiveness of teachers, scholars, and students.

2. To help innovators find allies. Most proposals for change need the support of many individuals and many groups, especially if the innovators are younger faculty members. In other words, administrative officers can help to recruit established and distinguished teachers to new educational projects as a means of reducing the risk to those promoting change. The administrator can often play a key role in mobilizing support in what is usually a relatively conservative organization.

3. To emphasize institution-wide interests rather than segmental ambitions. As was said earlier in this report, a mere collection of the aspirations of particular and diverse interest groups will not add up to a coherent educational program or to an institution with integrity of character and purpose.

4. To stimulate a thorough analysis of the problems facing the institution and to search out possibly fruitful alternatives for solution. Failure to deal with problems imaginatively is often the result of a poverty of ideas.

5. To stimulate a high degree of lateral communication as a means of breaking down departmental insulation, bringing about greater contact among disciplines, and enabling inventive minds to find their counterparts in other parts of the institution.

6. To supply information which may not be otherwise available.

7. To keep faculty and students informed of state-wide and system-wide policies and developments.

8. To comment on trends in higher education in the United States and other countries.[22]

Hopefully, the combination of wider participation in decision-making by those affected by decisions, and the increased awareness of administrators who can function in a more politically sensitive environment will help produce needed changes in governance procedures so that colleges can refocus on their primary purpose--education.

Conclusions

This paper has attempted to review, criticize, and propose a number of alternative models for student participation in the governance of junior colleges. The first step that the Subcommittee on the Revitalization of Student Government took was to change the focus from an emphasis on procedures for revitalization of student government to a focus on procedures and models for student participation in governance--a necessary precondition for the revitalization of student government.

After a review of a number of current trends, proposals, and criticisms of governance in colleges, it was decided that three main models would be discussed. Each of the models is a general manifestation of a philosophical approach to governance. Specific variations of each of the models can be found on a number of campuses in various stages of evolution.

The first model, the traditional model, was rejected on the grounds that "paternalism" and "in loco parentis" are no longer appropriate philosophies for working with college students in 1970. It was felt that this model is responsible in large part for the alienation, indifference, and confrontation tactics that have developed as student sophistication and rejection of this approach have grown. The second model, the separate jurisdiction model, is an outgrowth of the frustrations caused by the token approach implied in model one. This model was also rejected as a feasible alternative for governance of junior colleges because of its emphasis on further fragmentation and its potential for confrontation of positions arrived at with little prior communication or consultation.

The Subcommission agrees with the conclusions of a recent study on governance which stated "We think it is important to distinguish between the important goal of expanding the student role in governance and the erronecus assumption that a strengthened, separate central government is the most effective means to that end."[23]

The focus on expanding the student role in governance led the commission to a consideration of a number of "participatory" models for governance. Given the great diversity of goals, values, and philosophies in higher education, it was decided that the commission would present a number of alternative approaches to student participation in governance rather than stating only one model.

Three general participatory models were outlined. The first proposal calls for a federal model that includes a faculty senate, a student assembly, and an administrative-executive group, with procedures for intercommunication and consultation between the bodies. Representatives would be drawn from small districts, theoretically allowing for more personalized contact with identifiable constituencies, and thus providing a broader and more representative governance base.

The second participatory model calls for the delineation of areas of primary responsibility for faculty, administrators, and students, with established procedures for intercommunication and consultation. The keys to the success of this model lie in the degree of commitment on the part of the participants to contribute honestly and realistically, and on the ability of the segments to confer rationally <u>before</u> positions become rigid or polarized. The danger of this model lies in each area attempting to build empires which eventually lead to power politics and endless cycles of confrontation.

The final participatory model calls for the establishment of a "College Senate," which would have both faculty and students as voting members. Representatives would be selected from defined constituencies, thus providing for channels of communication and accountability. This model has been the object of both strong praise and strong criticism. Proponents of the approach see it as a way to bring relevance to student government as an important input to the decision-making process that will broaden the "zone of acceptance" and legitimacy of

decisions. Opponents of the approach raise a number of questions about the maturity, interest, and ability of transient students to contribute thoughtfully to difficult, frustrating, and often long, drawn-out committee meetings. While both sides have strong emotional cases, there is little rational evidence that the model will either fail or work. Again, this model should be implemented and tested in some of our colleges to help provide more rational evidence on these highly emotional topics.

The key role of administration and the necessity of strong commitment and preparation by both faculty and students is also stressed. Administrators must help mobilize resources toward more clearly defined goals and must emphasize institution-wide interests and needs over segmental ambitions. Also, certain areas, such as long-range planning and complicated budgetary matters, will require administrators skills in both preparation and communication.

Participatory models can offer either great promise or great dangers. In the end, only the abilities and rationality of trustees, faculty, students, and administrators will determine the success or failure of any given model.

Some Hard Realities

Regardless of the model of governance that exists at any campus, there are some difficult constraints which must be considered in any attempt to revitalize student participation in governance. Many of these constraints are somewhat unique to junior colleges and must be reviewed as one of the "givens" in attempting to plan a dynamic program that will enlist the enthusiasm and participation of a larger number of students.

Among these constraints are such factors as:

1. The junior college student is a commuting student. Many of these students retain neighborhood interests and never take the needed first step to get involved in college activities.

2. A very large percentage of junior college students work. O'Banion[24] estimates that 50-75 percent of junior college students work part time. Given demands of study, work, and commuting time, plus other competing interests, how many of these students can we realistically expect to participate in student government?
3. Some groups or individuals reject the concept of representative government and refuse to be represented by anyone but themselves. This may be a direct outgrowth of the failure to develop alternative "effective" channels for input to the decision-making structure, but it appears to be a trend at many campuses.
4. On a very large percentage of our campuses, the cost of participation (in terms of time, energy, and effort) is simply not worth the benefit (either personally or for the institution). Until we change both the nature of the reward system and the impact of student participation in governance, it is difficult to envision any dynamic change from what we currently have--mostly token government dominated by a few individuals who usually do not represent very many students.

If we realistically consider and plan ways to overcome these constraints, and if we sincerely attempt to develop models of governance that fit the unique character of a given institution, and if we seek imaginative ways to change the nature of the reward system and the results of participation in governance, then perhaps we can begin to revitalize student government.

While there will always be some problems of time constraints and differing interests, we can involve a larger number of students as contributors to both the process and substance of governance. The potential benefits to both the individual and the institution are great. No one is naive enough to envision a perfect model of governance with 100 percent participation of students. What is possible is a

more dynamic and broader-based student government complex that could assist in the governance of the academic community by representing and informing an important constituent of the community that previously has not had an effective voice in the decisions that influence their lives. While these are large tasks, they must be faced and overcome if our colleges are to continue to progress in a peaceful and rational manner.

There are many trends in our society today toward removing control of the academic community from inside to outside of our campuses. In many states, legislatures have investigated schools and cut budgets. The federal congress has had numerous proposals to investigate or regulate conduct on college campuses, and the general public has voiced its dissatisfaction at the polls by voting down bond issues and electing hard line officials. Unless institutions of higher education begin to more effectively govern themselves, other agencies will move in to govern them.

We have the ability to govern ourselves, what is needed is the commitment. We need to not only look at what is, but also at what needs to be. The time has come for a more participatory model of governance. "In loco parentis" is dead, and "separate jurisdictions" will only produce endless cycles of conflict. A focus on the problems of internal governance in our colleges is the categorical imperative for higher education in the 1970's.

REFERENCES

1. Richardson, R., "Recommendations on Student Rights and Freedoms," in the Junior College Journal, February 1969, p. 35.

2. The Culture of the University: Governance and Education, Report of the Study Commission on University Governance, University of California, Berkeley, January 15, 1968, p. 49.

3. Shoben, J. E., Jr., Students and University Governance: A Preliminary Sketch, unpublished paper, 1968, p. 2.

4. MacLeish, A., "The Revolt of Diminished Man," Saturday Review, June 7, 1969, pp. 16-19.

5. The Culture of the University, op. cit., p. 10.

6. Deegan, W. L., McConnell, T. R., Mortimer, K., and Stull, H., "Joint Participation in Decision Making," Berkeley, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, May, 1969, p. 47.

7. The Culture of the University, op. cit., p. 18.

8. Hoult, T. F., Hudson, J., Mayer, A. J., "On Keeping Our Cool in the Halls of Ivy," AAUP Bulletin, Summer, June 1969, Vol. 55, No. 2, p. 186.

9. The Culture of the University, op. cit., p. 6.

10. Ibid.

11. Siegel, D., in "Challenge and Change Forum," AAUP Bulletin, Summer, June 1969, Vol. 55, No. 2, p. 273.

12. Shoben, J. E., op. cit.

13. Ibid., p. 5.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid., p. 6.

16. Richardson, op. cit., p. 35.

17. Ibid.

18. Minutes, University of Minnesota Senate, April 10, 1969.

19. Minnesota Daily, April 8, 1969.

20. The Culture of the University, op. cit., p. 36.

21. Deegan, McConnell, Mortimer, Stull, op. cit., p. 38.

22. Ibid., p. 38, 39.

23. The Culture of the University, op. cit., p. 18.

24. O'Banion, T., "Institutional Governance and the Community College Student." Paper presented at Community College Trustee Conference, University of Washington, February 1, 1969.